

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are pending in this application, with claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 9-13 being independent. Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 11-13, 15, 17, 20 and 21 have been withdrawn from consideration, and claims 22-25 have been added.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 14, 16, 18 and 19 have been rejected as being obvious over Clough in view of Mori.

With respect to independent claim 1 and its dependent claims, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because neither Clough nor Mori describes or suggests an “EL element that includes a light emitting layer having an *electroluminescent organic compound*,” as recited in claim 1. Instead, Clough describes a *radioluminescent* material and Mori does not even describe or suggest a luminescent material. As is well known, an electroluminescent material emits light in response to an electrical current, while a radioluminescent material emits light in response to radiation.

Moreover, one of ordinary skill in the art would have had no motivation to combine Clough and Mori in the manner recited. The action indicates that it would have been obvious to combine Clough and Mori because Mori teaches that “the organometallic lattice structures are superior in performance to zeolite as a microporous structure.” While it is true that Mori indicates that the lattice structures are superior to zeolite, that superiority is with respect to the ability of the lattice structures to absorb and store gases. Mori is silent as to any benefit to be gained from the lattice structures in the context of a light emitting device. Accordingly, nothing in Mori (and nothing in Clough) would have motivated one of ordinary skill in the art to replace the zeolite used Clough’s luminescent device with the lattice structures of Mori.

For each of these reasons, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 1 and its dependent claims.

Like claim 1, each of independent claims 5, 9 and 10 recites “an organic EL element having a light emitting layer that includes an electroluminescent organic compound and a metal complex” having a particular lattice structure. Accordingly, applicant requests reconsideration

Applicant : Satoshi Seo
Serial No. : 09/997,173
Filed : November 30, 2001
Page : 8 of 8

Attorney's Docket No.: 12732-082001 / US5328

and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5, 9, 10 and their dependent claims for the reasons noted above with respect to claim 1.

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

Enclosed is a \$182 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee (\$110) and the extra claims fee (\$72). Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/18/03


John F. Hayden
Reg. No. 37,640

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40188593.doc